1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Daniel S. Mount, Esq. (Cal. Bar No. 77517) Kathryn G. Spelman, Esq. (Cal. Bar No. 15451 Daniel H. Fingerman, Esq. (Cal. Bar No. 22968 Kevin M. Pasquinelli, Esq. (Cal. Bar No. 24698 Mount & Stoelker, P.C. RiverPark Tower, Suite 1650 333 West San Carlos Street San Jose CA 95110-2740 Phone: (408) 279-7000 Fax: (408) 998-1473 Email: dmount@mount.com kspelman@mount.com	33)
8	dfingerman@mount.com	
9	kpasquinelli@mount.com	
10	Attorneys for Defendants Romi Mayder, Wesley Mayder, Silicon Test Systems Inc., and Silicon Test Solutions LLC	
11	United States District Court	
20 12 12 12	Northern District of California, San Jose Division	
18, P.C. UITE 16 SS STRE 95110-2 79-7000	VERIGY U.S. INC., a Delaware corporation) Case No. 5:07-cv-04330 (RMW) (HRL)
MOUNT & STOELKER, P.C. RIVERPARK TOWER, SUITE 1650 333 WEST SAN CARLOS STREET SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA 95110-2740 TELEPHONE (408) 279-7000 91 91 11 12 13	Plaintiff,	Defendants' Administrative Motion to Remove
JNT & S PARK TC EST SAN EST SAN EPHONE	vs.	Incorrectly Filed Document, Docket No. 56
MOU 333 Wi AN JOSH TELE	DOMLOMAD MAYDED on individual.	Judge: Hon. Ronald M. Whyte
× 17	ROMI OMAR MAYDER, an individual; WESLEY MAYDER, an individual;))
18	SILICON TEST SYSTEMS INC., a California corporation; SILICON TEST))
19	SOLUTIONS LLC, a California limited liability corporation,	
20	Defendants.	
21	Defendants.)
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		

4

28

Introduction

In this case, Verigy alleges that the defendants misappropriated its trade secrets. Naturally, many papers filed in this case discuss the parties' confidential and trade-secret information. To safeguard the confidentiality of that information, both parties have designated many documents as "Confidential" or "Highly Confidential" and filed papers under seal for the court's consideration.

Through an inadvertent error, the Defendants e-filed a highly confidential document, which briefly exposed it to public view. Upon realizing this error the next morning, the Defendants too immediate steps to correct the error and to safeguard the confidentiality of that document. The document has been temporarily "locked" by the court's e-filing staff, and a corrected version of the document has been e-filed.

The Defendants now request a court order permanently removing the incorrectly filed document and substituting the corrected version in its place.

Argument

On October 11, 2007, the Defendants submitted their Brief in Response to Order to Show Cause Re Preliminary Injunction (Docket No. 49) and supporting documents. The brief and many of its supporting documents contain information that both parties have designated "Confidential" or "Highly Confidential — Attorneys' Eyes Only" pursuant to the Stipulated Protective Order (Docket No. 28).

One of the supporting documents that contains Highly Confidential information was the Declaration of Thomas Schneck and its exhibits (Docket No. 56). Exhibit C is one of the exhibits that contains Highly Confidential information. In accordance with Civil L.R. 79-5, this declaration and its confidential exhibits (including Exhibit C) were lodged under seal, and a motion seeking court approval to seal them was simultaneously filed. A redacted version of the declaration was also publicly e-filed.

The next morning, the Defendants' counsel realized that a portion Exhibit C was inadvertently left in the redacted, publicly e-filed version of Mr. Schneck's declaration. Dan Fingerman, one of the Defendants' attorneys of record, took immediate action to shield that document from public view. He

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

telephoned the e-filing help desk and explained the error. The e-filing staff placed a temporary "lock" on the document and asked that a corrected version be e-filed.¹

Mr. Fingerman promptly e-filed a corrected version of the redacted declaration and its exhibits (Docket No. 58). Mr. Fingerman also promptly notified opposing counsel of the error and the steps being undertaken to correct it.²

A temporary "lock" remains on Docket No. 56. A corrected version has been filed as Docket No. 58. The Defendants now request a court order permanently removing Docket No. 56 from the record and recognizing that Docket No. 58 is a corrected version of that document.

The Defendants also request that this inadvertent error not be deemed a waiver of the Highly Confidential status of the document in question. The Defendants immediately notified opposing counsel of the error and invoked ¶ 5.3 of the Stipulated Protective Order to designate the document in question as "Highly Confidential — Attorneys Eyes Only."

Dated: October 12, 2007 Mount & Stoelker, P.C. Daniel H. Fingerman

/s/

Attorneys for Defendants Romi Mayder, Wesley Mayder, Silicon Test Systems Inc., and Silicon Test Solutions LLC

 $Z: \ \ CLIENTS \setminus S\ CLIENTS \setminus$

 $\int_{0.05}^{2} See$ Fingerman Declaration at ¶ 9 and Exhibit 3

 $[\]int_{0}^{1} See$ Fingerman Declaration at ¶¶ 5–8 and Exhibits 1 and 2